

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FILED IN THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF HAWAII

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SEP 13 2004

at 3:30'clock and 30 min. P.M.  
WALTER A. Y. H. CHINN, CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROY L. FROST,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 03-10242

D.C. No. CR-02-00117-1-DAE

**JUDGMENT**

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii  
(Honolulu).

This cause came on to be heard on the Transcript of the Record from the  
United States District Court for the District of Hawaii (Honolulu) and was duly  
submitted.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this  
Court, that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and hereby is  
**AFFIRMED.**

Filed and entered Monday, August 16, 2004

A TRUE COPY  
CATHY A. CATTERSON  
Clerk of Court  
ATTEST

SEP 08 2004

by:   
Deputy Clerk

**FILED**

AUG 16 2004

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

ROY L. FROST,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 03-10242

D.C. No. CR-02-00117-1-DAE

MEMORANDUM\*

**RECEIVED**  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

SEP 13 2004

DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Hawaii  
David A. Ezra, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 9, 2004\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, Chief Judge, RAWLINSON and CALLAHAN,  
Circuit Judges.

Roy L. Frost appeals his guilty-plea conviction and 27-month sentence for possession of an unregistered firearm, in violation of 26 U.S.C. §§ 5845(a), 5861(d).

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), counsel for Frost has filed a brief stating there are no grounds for relief, and a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. Frost has not filed a pro se supplemental brief.

Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penon v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 83 (1988), discloses no grounds for relief. Counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED** and the district court's judgment is **AFFIRMED**.

